

of those who once learned from the same Church that what our Father asked was the deep homage of the heart and the dedication of the life.

Can one be blind to the unscriptural views promulgated respecting the Lord's Supper, now fondly termed the Eucharist. While the Romanists are charged with substituting the Virgin Mary for Jesus, it is too plain that some false members of the Church of England are substituting bread and wine for that great and gracious Being. The term "transubstantiation" is indeed avoided, but we are told of the "real presence," while every adjunct of the Lord's Supper which tends to invest it with mystical meaning, and enshroud it with superstitious awe, is plainly fostered by act, if not distinctly recommended by words. Your Lordship studiously avoids the mere word "altar," though your pupils and followers glory in it and use it. But the shadow is of no consequence if we have the substance to contend with. And however the simple title in this matter may be shunned, the real thing itself is palpable enough. The plain old Communion Table, with its fair white linen cloth, is when possible to be decked with cloths of gorgeous hue and rich embroidery, it must be raised to a certain height, be surrounded with its steps, approached with awe, and every circumstance of duty performed thereat to be of such a nature as to call up the ideas of priest, altar, and sacrifice. There is meaning in all these things, or they are mere puerilities, simple child's play; and as I believe that every intelligent man would indignantly repudiate the charge that he intended to trifle with God, the only alternative is that they are emblematic, or symbolize truths or supposed truths.

Then we have the grave, serious proposition made in a paper, conducted by a high dignitary of the Church, and a Doctor in Divinity, of our duty to bring about a union with the Roman and Greek Churches. This, indeed, is proposed by a correspondent, but one, I have some reason to believe, who stands uncommonly high in your Lordship's favor. Putting aside the Church of Rome, is it not a sad sign of a falling Church when her guardians and directors are advocating union with the Greek Church—can they possibly know anything of its history or tenets? And this in preference to a union with those pure branches of the Church of Christ, singularly honored by the great Head of the body during the last three hundred years in the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints. Who can say, after this open, bold avowal, that the leaning is not towards Rome with some, and towards its somewhat different, but kindred sister? I am aware of the severe censure passed on Rome for dogmas lately promulgated, but I am also aware of the great principles so carefully laid down by which Rome is shown to be infinitely superior to these branches of the Church of Christ which are stigmatized as being without the pale. Alas! that the Church of England should ever have within its pale those who could make such a choice. I shall be told that the late movements, which are now culminating to a head, are simply a protest against Ritualism, on the one hand, and the extreme